REMARKS

The Office Action mailed May 2, 2008, in view of the Advisory Action mailed November 14, 2008, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 28 has been added in the present paper. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-4, 9-14, 20-24, and 28 are presented for examination upon entry of the present paper.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 9-13, and 20-24 stand rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,265,894 to Reblewski et al. (hereinafter referred to as *"Reblewski"*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,064,677 to Kappler, et al. (hereinafter referred to as *"Kappler"*). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, among other features, "wherein the signal inclusion schedule selects the plurality of signals from at least one pin when the message is assembled." Support for the amended features can be found in the specification when read as a whole, and in particular, in at least paragraphs [0033] and [0062].

With respect to the amended features, Applicants incorporate herein by way of reference the remarks included at page 6 of Applicants' "Response and Request for Reconsideration" dated October 31, 2008. In the Advisory Action, the Office stated that Applicants' remarks were not commensurate with the scope of claim 1. Even assuming (without admitting) that the Office's characterization of those remarks is proper, Applicants submit that the referenced remarks are commensurate in scope with the above-noted features now recited in amended claim 1.

Even assuming (without admitting) that *Kappler* describes features related a signal inclusion schedule that specifies a frequency of occurrence of each of a plurality of signals in a message as recited in claim 1, *Kappler* achieves such a frequency by selectively placing in advance the data to be transmitted into time lines 66a-66e (e.g., output FIFO queues). See *Kappler* at col. 12, lines 30-55. *Kappler* does not select a plurality of signals from at least one pin *when the message is assembled,* as claimed. *Kappler* at col. 13, lines 4-10 acknowledges that a tradeoff is made between precision and the amount of memory (e.g., the number of time lines 66a-66e) that needs to be implemented by virtue of such a scheme/configuration. One of

skill in the art would appreciate that the use of time lines 66a-66e in *Kappler* represents a restraint/constraint on the future growth of the *Kappler* system. In particular, as data rates increase, the *Kappler* system memory/time lines would prohibit the *Kappler* system from achieving greater precision.

Conversely, the amended features of claim 1 relate to a signal inclusion schedule selecting a plurality of signals from at least one pin *when the message is assembled.* One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the amended features provide for a reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit that is less sensitive to the operating conditions in which the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit is implemented. As such, one of skill in the art would appreciate that the reconfigurable emulation integrated circuit may be used across a larger number of units/platforms, and accommodate growth or changes in data rate. Furthermore, one of skill in the art would appreciate that by selecting a plurality of signals from at least one pin when a message is assembled as recited in amended claim 1, the emulation integrated circuit of claim 1 would more readily lend itself to emulating (timing) relationships between the plurality of signals relative to the *Kappler* system because the *Kappler* system introduces skew between the plurality of signals in terms of timing by virtue of non-ideal behavior associated with time lines 66a-66e (e.g., the timing characteristics of one of time lines 66a-66e (e.g., 66a) relative to another of time lines 66a-66e (e.g., 66b) is not identical).

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is allowable over *Kappler* because *Kappler* does not teach or suggest selecting a plurality of signals from at least one pin when the message is assembled, as claimed.

Notwithstanding whether *Reblewski* is properly combinable with *Kappler*, *Reblewski* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Kappler* described above with respect to claim 1. As such, claim 1 is allowable over the applied references.

Amended independent claims 9, 20, and 24 recite features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1. As such, claims 9, 20, and 24 are allowable for at least reasons substantially similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1.

The dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claims.

New Claim(s)

Claim 28 is new and is supported by the instant application specification when read as a whole, and in particular, by at least paragraph [0061].

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicit prompt notification of the same. Should the Examiner find that a telephonic or personal interview would expedite passage to issue of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below. Applicants look forward to passage to issue of the present application at the earliest convenience of the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Date: Dec. 3, 2008   By: /Ross Dannenberg/
                                     Ross A. Dannenberg
                                     Registration No. 49,024
                                     1100 13th Street, N.W.
                                     Suite 1200
                                     Washington, D.C. 20005
                                     Phone: (202) 824-3000
                                     Fax: (202) 824-3001